

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing Amendments and following Remarks. Claims 1-15 were previously pending.

Applicants cancel claim 2 by way of this amendment without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 3, 5-10 and 12-14 have been amended. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added by the instant amendments to the claims. Furthermore, Applicants, submit that the amended claims, as well as the previously pending claims are patentably distinct from the cited references.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 112

Claims 8 and 9 have been rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph. Claims 8 and 9 have been rejected on the Examiner's contention that the term "elongate coil" lacks sufficient antecedent basis. (See Office Action page 2). Claims 8 and 9 have been amended and Applicants respectfully submit that as amended it is clear that "said one of the coils" now has proper antecedent basis. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 102

Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 USC § 102 as being allegedly anticipated by Abe (US Patent No. 4,989,714) ("Abe"). Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are not anticipated by Abe. More specifically, Claim 7 has been amended in part to depend from amended independent claim 1. As such, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 and dependent claim 7 are not anticipated by Abe. For at least similar reasons, Applicants submit claims 8-12 are also not anticipated by Abe as each directly or indirectly depends from independent claim 1. For at least these reasons. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 103(a) in view of King and Taylor

Claims 1-6 and 13 are rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over King (US Pub. No. 2003/0150687) ("King") in view of Taylor (US Patent No. 6,206,167) ("Taylor").

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection and submit the pending claims are patentably distinct from the cited references taken alone or in combination.

I. Applicants Submit Claims 1, 3-6 Are Patentably Distinct From The Cited References

Applicants submit the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 as King and Taylor, alone or in combination, do not render obvious, at least the subject matter of amended independent claim 1.

Amended independent claim 1 recites inter alis:

the path is curved such that the face of the coin is urged by centripetal force against the coin guiding surface as it moves along the path and through the coin sensing station. (emphasis added)

The Examiner states that "King fails to disclose said rundown path as being curved." (See Office Action page 3.) Instead, to remedy this deficiency, the Examiner turns to Taylor.

The Examiner asserts:

Taylor teaches coin rundown path 10 being curved for the purpose of causing coin to engage guiding surface 20 via centripetal force (see Figures 2 and 3). (See Office Action page 3)

However, Applicants submit that neither King nor Taylor alone or in combination discuss that the coin is urged by centripetal force . . . through the coin sensing station as recited by amended independent claim 1. Specifically, in contrast to the Examiner's assertion, Applicants submit that Taylor does not implement a curved rundown path such that the face of the coin is urged by centripetal force against the coin guiding surface as in claim 1. Instead as clearly illustrated in Figures 2 and 3, Taylor's coin rundown path is formed with a distinct shape with sidewalls 20, 30 that have distinct radii R1 and R2 that act to guide the coins. Taylor specifically discusses a "chute with a narrow passageway 20 and 30 and two sidewalls 20, 30. The sidewalls 20, 30 are spaced appropriately for maintaining the coin C in its substantially vertical, on-edge orientation."(See Taylor col. 2, lines 9-12 and Figures 2 and 3.) Accordingly, in contrast to Taylor's narrow chute, the claimed coin acceptor has no requirements to form the rundown path with a narrow passageway to keep coins vertical. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Taylor's

system taken alone or in combination with King does not result in or render obvious the claimed system of independent claim 1.

For at least similar reasons, claims 3-6 are also not anticipated by King in view of Taylor as each directly or indirectly depends from independent claim 1. For at least these reasons. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

II. Applicants Submit Claim 13 Is Patentably Distinct From The Cited References

Examiner states that "King fails to disclose said rundown path as being curved." Again the Examiner turns to Taylor to remedy King's deficiencies. More specifically, the Examiner asserts:

Taylor teaches coin rundown path 10 being curved for the purpose of causing coins to engage guiding surface 20 via centripetal force.

Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that Taylor does not remedy the deficiencies of King.

Claim 13 cites inter alia:

the coin rundown path including a curved coin guiding surface on which a major face of the coin is urged by centripetal force to lie in sliding engagement during its passage along the coin rundown path through the coin sensing station . . .

With respect to at least claim 13, the combination of King and Taylor is still deficient as either reference taken alone or in combination fails to disclose " a curved coin guiding surface on which a major face of the coin is urged by centripetal force to lie in sliding engagement . . ." as recited in amended independent claim 13. As discussed above Taylor implements a "chute with a narrow passageway 20 and 30 and two sidewalls 20, 30. The sidewalls 20, 30 are spaced appropriately for maintaining the coin C in its substantially vertical, on-edge orientation."(See Taylor col. 2, lines 9-12 and Figures 2 and 3.) Applicants respectfully submit a coin acceptor configured as recited in independent claim 13 is not rendered obvious by Taylor's narrow chute for keeping coins vertical structure.

Applicants submit that for at least these reasons, claims 1, 3-6 and 13 are not obvious over King in view of Taylor and that this ground of rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 103(a) in view of King, Taylor and Chalabian

Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over King in view of Taylor in view of Chalabian (US Patent No. 4,062,435) ("Chalabian").

Claim 14 recites inter alia "means to relieve a pressure differential between the major face of the coin and the curved coin guiding surface. . . ." In accordance with 35 U.S.C. 112 sixth paragraph, means plus function language "shall be construed to cover the corresponding structure, material, or acts described in the specification and equivalents thereof."

Applicants respectfully submit the Examiner has not established Chalabian's longitudinal slots 121, 123 would be analogous to the structure described in the specification. Applicants submit by way of non-limiting example only, configuring a curved surface to include negative pressure relief holes 43 which give rise to a negative pressure region is not analogous to Chalabian's longitudinal slots 121, 123. Accordingly, Applicants submit Chalabian's slots do not render obvious generating a negative pressure region.

Applicants respectfully request that this ground of rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the pending claims are not anticipated or rendered obvious by the cited references taken alone or in combination for at least the reasons discussed above and that each of the pending claims is now in condition for allowance. If a telephone conference would facilitate prosecution of this application in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 03-1240, Order No. 17178-006. In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 03-1240, Order No. 17178-006.

Respectfully submitted,
CHADBOURNE & PARKE, L.L.P.

Dated: January 4, 2008

By: /Daniel C. Sheridan/

Daniel C. Sheridan

Registration No. 53, 585

Correspondence Address:
Chadbourne & Parke LLP
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10112
212-408-5100 Telephone
212-541-5369 Facsimile